

The Majorana Fermions for Quantum $S=1/2$ Antiferromagnet ?

ALEXANDER MOROZ*

*Institute of Theoretical Physics
EPFL
PHB-Ecublens
CH-1015 Lausanne, Suisse*

ABSTRACT

Recently it has been suggested by A. M. Tsvelik that quantum $S=1/2$ antiferromagnet can be described by the Majorana fermions in an irreducible way and without any constraint. In contrast to this claim we shall show that this representation is highly reducible. It is a direct sum of four irreducible fundamental representations of $su(2)$ algebra.

*e-mail address : moroz@eldp.epfl.ch

When dealing with the Heisenberg spin $S = 1/2$ antiferromagnet one usually represents the spin operators $S^{a'}$ s in terms of fermionic degrees of freedom. In the Schwinger representation of spin operators,

$$S^a = b_\alpha^\dagger \sigma_{\alpha\beta}^a b_\beta, \quad (1)$$

where the fermionic degrees of freedom satisfy the constraint

$$b_\alpha^\dagger b_\alpha = 1, \quad (2)$$

and $\sigma^{a'}$ s are the Pauli matrices. As one easily finds this representation possesses $U(1)$ gauge invariance. However this $U(1)$ gauge symmetry is known to be strongly restricted due to a plaquette identity. On a square lattice this identity allows only for such $U(1)$ gauge configurations (on bonds of a lattice) which give Z_2 -flux plaquette configurations [1]. Recently in this preprint network a paper by A. M. Tsvelik [2] has appeared where a new fermionic description of a quantum $S = 1/2$ antiferromagnet without constraint has been suggested in terms of the Majorana fermions. A proof has been announced that low-lying excitations in a spin liquid state of $S = 1/2$ antiferromagnet are $S = 1$ fermions.

In notation of [2] the Majorana fermions on a lattice site r are denoted by $\eta_a(r)$, $a = 1, 2, 3$. They satisfy the Clifford algebra:

$$\{\eta_a(r), \eta_b(r')\}_+ = \delta_{ab} \delta_{rr'}. \quad (3)$$

The spin operators are represented as bilinears in the Majorana fermions,

$$S^a(r) := -\frac{i}{2} \varepsilon_{abc} \eta_b(r) \eta_c(r). \quad (4)$$

One checks that (4) reproduces the usual commutation relations of the spin operators,

$$[S^a(r), S^b(r')] = i \varepsilon^{abc} \delta_{rr'} S^c(r). \quad (5)$$

No constraint on the fermionic degrees of freedom is needed provided the representation is irreducible. This irreducibility was inferred in [2] from

$$S^a(r)S^a(r) = \frac{1}{4}, \quad \sum_a S^a(r)S^a(r) = \frac{3}{4}. \quad (6)$$

In contrast to the Schwinger representation (1-2) this representation possesses Z_2 gauge invariance only,

$$\eta_a(r) \rightarrow (-1)^{q(r)} \eta_a(r), \quad (7)$$

$$q(r) = \pm 1.$$

At first sight this approach may seem to be appealing since apart from missing constraint it seems to treat directly physical Z_2 degrees of freedom. However, as we shall show in a while, in contrast to the claim in [2] the representation *is not irreducible*. First of all there is a *mismatch between the number of states* in the fundamental representation of $su(2)$ algebra and the representation (4). The representation space of the Majorana fermions is *eight-dimensional* and not two-dimensional as it should be for the fundamental representation of $su(2)$. It is built up by vacuum vector and by η_a 's, $\eta_a\eta_b$, $a \neq b$, and $\eta_1\eta_2\eta_3$. Moreover the vacuum is not invariant under the action of spin operators. This is the reason why this approach cannot be extended to treat holes, i.e., to deal with the Hubbard model in the limit $U \rightarrow \infty$ away from half filling.

The above dimensional argument together with (6) suggest that the representation (4) is a *direct sum of four fundamental representations of $su(2)$* . One immediately finds that vector spaces generated by vectors $\{\eta_1, \eta_2, \eta_3, \eta_1\eta_2\eta_3\}$ and $\{\eta_1\eta_2, \eta_1\eta_3, \eta_2\eta_3, 0\}$ are *invariant spaces* under the action of spin operators $S^{a'}$ s. Therefore these spaces are four dimensional, one expects that they can be further reduced. This can be confirmed as follows. Let us take

one of them, say $\{\eta_1, \eta_2, \eta_3, \eta_1\eta_2\eta_3\}_{span}$. In the above basis,

$$S^1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & i/4 \\ 0 & 0 & -i/2 & 0 \\ 0 & i/2 & 0 & 0 \\ -i & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad S^2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & i/2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & i/4 \\ -i/2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -i & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (8)$$

$$S^3 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & i/2 & 0 & 0 \\ -i/2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -i/4 \\ 0 & 0 & i & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (9)$$

To find invariant subspaces we shall look for the spectrum of S^3 . Since $\{\eta_1, \eta_2\}_{span}$ and $\{\eta_3, \eta_1\eta_2\eta_3\}_{span}$ are invariant subspaces under the action of S^3 , one can diagonalize S^3 independently in any of them. One finds eigenvectors $e_+ = i\eta_1 + \eta_2$ and $e_- = \eta_1 + i\eta_2$ with respective eigenvalues $\lambda_{\pm} = \pm 1/2$ in the first invariant subspace, and $\bar{e}_+ = (1/2)\eta_3 + i\eta_1\eta_2\eta_3$ and $\bar{e}_- = (i/2)\eta_3 + \eta_1\eta_2\eta_3$ with respective eigenvalues $\bar{\lambda}_{\pm} = \pm 1/2$ in the second invariant subspace. Eventually, one checks that the spaces $\{e_+, \bar{e}_-\}_{span}$ and $\{\bar{e}_+, e_-\}_{span}$ are *invariant irreducible spaces under the action of the spin operators $S^{a'}$ s*. Thus they provide fundamental *two dimensional* representation of $su(2)$. The original Majorana representation is the direct sum of them. This is immediately seen from the block diagonal form of the spin operators in the invariant subspace $\{e_+, \bar{e}_-, \bar{e}_+, e_-\}_{span} (\equiv \{\eta_1, \eta_2, \eta_3, \eta_1\eta_2\eta_3\}_{span})$,

$$S^1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1/4 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & -1/4 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad S^2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & i/4 & 0 & 0 \\ -i & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -i \\ 0 & 0 & i/4 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (10)$$

$$S^3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1/2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1/2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1/2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1/2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (11)$$

Therefore the Majorana representation provides nothing but the fermionic description of a “four-flavor” Heisenberg spin $S = 1/2$ antiferromagnet.

If one confines oneself to a particular invariant subspace, say $\{e_+, \bar{e}_-\}_{span}$, one finds that the basis vectors e_+ and $\bar{e}_-$ considered as operators satisfy the relations $\{e_+, \bar{e}_-\}_+ = [e_+, \bar{e}_-]_- = e_+ \bar{e}_-$, since $\bar{e}_- e_+ = 0$. Thus in a given invariant subspace one can work without constraints provided one orders all operators on a given site before calculating expectation values with $\bar{e}_-$ to the left of e_+ . This is equivalent to the Gutzwiller projection. Therefore there is no additional advantage by using the Majorana representation (4) over the usual Schwinger representation of spin operators (1-2).

References

- [1] B. Marston, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **60**, 1914 (1988).
- [2] A. M. Tsvelik, *New fermionic description of quantum $S=1/2$ antiferromagnet*, Harvard preprint, cond-mat/9206007.